



**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**In re U.S. Patent Application  
Dale A. FLOOD**

**Confirmation Number: 5621**

**Serial Number: 10/716,505**

**Group Art Unit: 1725**

**Filed: November 20, 2003**

**Examiner: Clifford C. Shaw**

**For: PROCESS FOR WELDING**

**Attorney Docket: FLOO3001/JEK**

**RESPONSE AND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 223213-1450

Sir:

**INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS**

This is responsive to the Official Action mailed March 7, 2006 rejecting claims 1, 3, 4 and 9-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Reconsideration of this rejection is requested in view of the submissions and comments contained in or accompanying this paper.

This response is timely filed in view of a petition to enlarge the shortened statutory period for response to the Office Action submitted herewith, including the requisite fee.

**REMARKS**

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 9-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flood in view of the Bhadha article.

As acknowledged by the examiner, Flood U.S. 5,686,002 discloses the basic process recited in the rejected claims, which further define an improvement over the basic Flood process insofar as they recite that the open root first pass weld of the basic process using a hydrogen shield gas mixture is carried out in a substantial absence of moisture in the area undergoing welding using a shield gas delivery elastomer hose having a moisture permeability coefficient of 0 to 275.

As the examiner understands, this invention addresses a problem associated with the basic Flood patented process not heretofore recognized, namely the adverse